## Case 7:17-cv-07359-NSR Document 62 Filed 05/27/20 Page 1 of 2 Document 61 Filed 05/27/20 Page 1 of 2



## U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney Southern District of New York

86 Chambers Street New York, New York 10007

The application is X granted.

May 27, 2020

Nelson S. Román, U.S.D.J. Dated: <u>May 27, 2020</u>

White Plains, New York 10601

Clerk of the Court requested to terminate the motion (doc. 61).

By ECF

The Honorable Nelson S. Román United States District Judge Southern District of New York 300 Quarropas Street White Plains, NY 10601

Re:

Male Dixon, aka James King v. Blackensee, 17 Civ. 7359 (NSR)

Dear Judge Román:

This Office represents defendant Barbara Von Blanckensee, Warden of the Federal Correctional Institution in Otisville, New York, (the "government") in this action brought by incarcerated plaintiff Male Dixon, also known as James King. I write respectfully to request a stay of all discovery, including any pending deadlines, in this action until the government's interlocutory appeal is resolved. Plaintiff's counsel consents to this request.

On June 11, 2019, this Court granted the government's motion to dismiss in part, but denied it with respect to plaintiff's Fifth and First Amendment claims against Warden Blanckensee in her personal capacity under Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). See Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 35. On March 26, 2020, the Court denied in part Warden Blanckensee's motion for reconsideration of the Court's decision on her motion to dismiss. See Opinion and Order, Dkt. No. 55. On May 22, 2020, the government appealed from the Court's June 11, 2019, and March 26, 2020, decisions. See Dkt. No. 60. In light of the government's appeal, discovery should be stayed, in line with the purposes of the qualified immunity doctrine. See Pearson v. Callahan, 555 U.S. 223, 231 (2009); Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982) ("Until [the] threshold [qualified] immunity question is resolved, discovery should not be allowed."). In addition, because the issues raised by the Court's decisions on appeal concern the entirety of plaintiff's remaining claim, this Court lacks jurisdiction over plaintiff's remaining claim until the mandate of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit issues. See Retirement Board of the Policemen's Annuity and Benefit Fund of the City of Chicago v. Bank of New York Mellon, 297 F.R.D. 218, 220-21 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) ("[A]n interlocutory appeal, unless frivolous, generally divests the district court of jurisdiction respecting the issues raised and decided in the order on appeal." (quoting Garcia v. Bloomberg, No. 11 Civ. 6957 (JSR), 2012 WL 3127173, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2012))).

I thank the Court for its consideration of this submission.

USDC SDNY			
DOCUMENT			
ELECTRONIC	CAL	LY F	TLED
DOC#:			
DATE FILED:	51	27	2020

Respectfully submitted, GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney

By:

/s/ Steven J. Kochevar Steven J. Kochevar Assistant United States Attorney 86 Chambers Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor New York, NY 10007 Telephone: (212) 637-2715

Fax: (212) 637-2717

Email: steven.kochevar@usdoj.gov

cc (by ECF): Counsel of Record